



## HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

ELlicott City Historic District ■ LAWYERS HILL Historic District

3430 Court House Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

---

*Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning*

VOICE 410-313-2350

FAX 410-313-3042

### November Minutes

#### Thursday, November 1, 2018; 7:00 p.m.

The November meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission was held on Thursday, November 1, 2018 in the C. Vernon Gray room located at 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, MD 21043. A few technical corrections were made to the minutes. Mr. Roth moved to approve the September minutes. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved. Mr. Reich moved to approve the October minutes. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Members present: Allan Shad, Chair; Eileen Tennor, Vice-Chair; Drew Roth, Secretary; Erica Zoren; Bruno Reich

Staff present: Beth Burgess, Samantha Holmes, Susan Overstreet, Daniel Bennett, Lewis Taylor

---

#### PLANS FOR APPROVAL

##### Consent Agenda

1. MA-18-16c – 3829 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City
2. MA-18-02c – 3744-3748 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City

##### Regular Agenda

3. HPC-18-53 – 8116 Main Street, Ellicott City
4. HPC-18-54 – 8307 Main Street, Ellicott City
5. HPC-18-55 – 3820 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City
6. HPC-18-56 – 8484 - 8494 Main Street, Ellicott City
7. HPC-18-57 – 3612 Fels Lane, Ellicott City
8. HPC-18-58 – 8191 Main Street, Ellicott City
9. HPC-18-59 – 3802 Church Road, Ellicott City

## CONSENT AGENDA

### **MA-18-16c – 3829 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City**

Final tax credit claim 20.112.

Applicant: Josh Anderson

**Background & Scope of Work:** This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT, the building dates to 1800. The Applicant was pre-approved for tax credits to replace the roof through the Minor Alterations process in case MA-18-16 in May 2018. The Applicant has submitted documentation that \$14,290.00 was spent on the eligible, pre-approved work and seeks \$3,572.50 in final tax credits.

**Staff Comments:** The work complies with that pre-approved and the invoice and cancelled checks total the requested amount.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval as submitted for \$3,572.50 in final tax credits.

**Testimony:** Mr. Shad asked if anyone in the audience wished to present testimony. There was no one in the audience who wanted to testify.

**Motion:** Mr. Roth moved to approve. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

### **MA-18-01c – 3744-3748 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City**

Final tax credit claim 20.112.

Applicant: Susan Duff

**Background & Scope of Work:** This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to the Historic Sites Inventory form the buildings date to the early 1800s. The Applicant was pre-approved for tax credits for front façade repairs and alterations through the Minor Alterations process in case MA-18-01 in January 2018. The Applicant has submitted documentation that \$23,455.00 was spent on the eligible, pre-approved work and is eligible for \$5,863.75 in final tax credits.

**Staff Comments:** The work complies with that pre-approved and the statements and cancelled checks total the eligible amount.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval of \$5,863.75 in final tax credits.

**Testimony:** Mr. Shad asked if anyone in the audience wished to present testimony. There was no one in the audience who wanted to testify.

**Motion:** Mr. Roth moved to approve. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

## REGULAR AGENDA

### **HPC-18-53 – 8116 Main Street, Ellicott City**

Certificate of Approval and Tax Credit Pre-Approval for exterior alterations/repairs.

Applicant: Charlene Townsend

**Background & Scope of Work:** This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT, the building dates to 1830. This building was damaged in the 2016 flood and the door leading to the apartments and the storefront windows were destroyed and had to be replaced.

The building was again damaged in the 2018 flood and both doors (retail and apartment) as well as the storefront windows were destroyed. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval to paint the front façade including second and third floor windows and sashes.

The Applicant also seeks approval, including tax credit pre-approval, to make alterations to front façade, in order to make the building safer from flood water.

The Applicant proposes to alter the storefront windows so that the entire storefront looks like the mural painted on the plywood that is currently covering the building. This design also mimics the panels below the windows that are found on the neighboring building at 8120 Main Street. The storefront windows would be significantly reduced in size in this proposal, which would utilize a 5'x5' window. The proposed windows will either be Anderson tempered laminate glass windows or Pella Impact Resistant windows with a wood frame.

The new storefront door will be a half light over 2-panel wood door, painted a cream color. The previously existing historic door was a ¾ light over 3 panel (horizontally laid out) door. The door leading to the apartments will be a 6-panel wood door. This replacement is the same style as the replacement used from the 2016 flood, but does not match the historic door that was destroyed, as shown in Figure 3.

The previous storefront was blue and white, but the Applicant now proposes to use the colors as shown in Figure 4, incorporating the coral color from the second floor into the first floor storefront and the light pink/coral color (Benjamin Moore Pearly Pink) on the plywood mural.

The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval and Façade Improvement Program funds for the work.

**Staff Comments:** Chapter 6.K of the Guidelines recommends, “preserve the form and details of existing historic storefronts. Uncover or replace architectural detailing that has been obscured by later additions” and “where physical, photographic or other documentation exists for an earlier storefront, or for the building’s appearance before a storefront façade was added, restore the earlier storefront design.” While this proposal does not meet those recommendations, the intent of the storefront alterations are to mitigate potential future flood damage. The historic door leading to the apartments was lost in the 2016 flood and the historic door leading to the retail space was lost in the 2018 flood. The storefront windows were blown out in both floods, and due to their floor to ceiling height, would be likely to blow out in future floods.

The new design retains the historic cornice and brackets on the first floor and will utilize doors of a similar design. The existing color from the second floor will be incorporated into the new panels on the first floor. The new design complies with Chapter 6.K recommendations, “when planning storefront repairs or alterations, unify the upper and lower floors in the new design. Use appropriate and matching materials and colors throughout the façade; use materials appropriate to the style and period of the building; and use details of one time and type, within the limits of that building and its date of construction” and “design new storefronts to fit within the first floor building openings as formed by columns, piers and cornices.” The new panels below the

window will serve a practical purpose not only in reducing the size of the storefront windows, but they will be reinforced with an internal cinderblock wall using new full-size blocks with concrete and rebar. The block will be waterproofed with Sherwin Williams Loxon XP. The windows will be reduced in size, which typically is not recommended, however Figures 1 and 2 above, show the repeated damage to the windows in a flood situation. The windows will still be large and will be impact resistant, which the previous windows were not. While these alterations are not typically supported by the Guidelines, the Applicant has made an attempt to mitigate future flood damage by reinforcing the storefront with stronger materials than previously existed.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

**Testimony:** Mr. Shad swore in the Applicant, Charlene Townsend, and asked if she had any information to add or correct in the staff report. Ms. Townsend did not have anything to add or correct.

Ms. Tennor asked Staff if they thought these kind of changes (i.e. alterations to the storefront/raising of the knee wall) will be common. Ms. Burgess said that she does expect this type of alteration to be more common due to the flood damage, but pointed out that many storefronts have been altered over the years and have been enlarged as they became retail buildings. She clarified that she was not speaking specifically to this building. Regarding this building, Ms. Burgess explained that Staff would have concerns if the Applicant was not proposing to use the impact resistant glass, etc. to try and floodproof the building.

Ms. Townsend said she is very happy with the new look and said it coordinates well with her neighbor's storefronts, which are similar in size and have the same panel details.

Ms. Zoren said that she agreed with installing the panels under the windows for flood proofing, but was unclear on why the glass on the top and sides was also going to be reduced in size. She said that she would like to see the trim widths closer to what normally existed and a larger piece of glass above the sill height. Ms. Townsend said the windows she is proposing are larger than the windows her neighbors have. Ms. Zoren said she finds the sill height to be appropriate, but that anything altered above the window opening does not seem to have to do with flood mitigation.

Mr. Reich asked if Ms. Townsend was using flood resistant doors. Ms. Townsend said that she could not afford them, but said the current proposal was in-keeping with historic preservation, but she could not afford more. Mr. Reich made a few flood proofing suggestions on the doors and the windows, but found that Ms. Townsend was doing enough to preserve the historic pieces of the building.

Ms. Townsend said that she would like to make the transom windows over the 5x5 glass windows into framed panels instead of transom windows. She thought that would match the bottom panels and be less expensive.

Mr. Shad asked if anyone in the audience wanted to testify. No one did.

**Motion:** Mr. Reich moved to approve as submitted, with the option to make the panels above the storefront solid or glass. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

#### **HPC-18-54 – 8307 Main Street, Ellicott City**

Certificate of Approval to install sign.

Applicant: Nicholas Johnson

**Background & Scope of Work:** This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1930. The Applicant proposes to install a sign, which is to be painted directly on the

painted brick façade of the building. The original sign design was for a 5-foot high by 24-foot wide sign, for a total of 120 square feet. Staff and the Applicant met to discuss the sign and the Applicant had the drawings revised and scaled the sign down to 4'3" high by 17'9" wide, for a total of 75.43 square feet. The sign will have a black background with white text and a white border and read on one line "SU CASA." The sign will be located within a defined panel area that is on the brick building façade.

**Staff Comments:** The overall size of the sign has been reduced significantly in square footage, but still does not comply with Chapter 11.B recommendations, which recommend, "in most cases, limit the area of signage to one-half square foot of sign area for each linear foot of primary street frontage, with a limit of eight square feet in area for any one sign. More sign area is appropriate for some of Ellicott City's larger buildings, where these signs would result in signs that are ineffective or not in scale with the building." As this is a detached building that is set back from the street, a larger sign area may be appropriate, but the proposed size is still significantly larger than the Guidelines recommend.

For reference and guidance to this case, the Commission has recently had several applications for signs of this size, but the most comparable is the sign for Main Street Ballroom, located on the back of the building. The Ballroom sign was originally proposed to be 34 inches high by 19 feet wide and eventually approved to not exceed 24 inches in height (the width was determined using existing proportions on the building, an exact length of feet was not specified, rather the architectural details the sign was to fit between were specified).

The Guidelines provide a formula of one half square foot of sign area for each linear foot of street frontage as the maximum for each building. The building façade is approximately 50 feet in length, which results in a maximum area of 25 square feet. Further, Chapter 11.A states, "use lettering that is between one-third and one-half of the sign height and covers no more than 75 percent of the face of the sign." Additional black space around the letter would further comport with the Guidelines.

Aside from the scale, the sign otherwise complies with Chapter 11 recommendations, such as, "use simple, legible words and graphics; use a minimum number of colors, generally no more than three. Coordinate sign colors with the colors used in the building façade; and emphasize the identification of the establishment rather than an advertising message on the face of the sign."

While not part of the HPC process, the Guidelines explain, "painting a sign directly on a wall or another structural part of a building is not permitted by the county Sign Code. However, the Board of Appeals may grant a variance for such signs if they are found to contribute significantly to the historical, architectural or aesthetic character of the area." The Applicant should contact the Department of Inspection, Licenses and Permits, administrators of the sign code, for more information on this matter.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval of the sign design as submitted, but recommends the sign be further reduced in size to be more consistent with the Guidelines.

**Testimony:** Mr. Shad swore in the Applicant, Nicholas Johnson, and asked if he had any information to add or correct in the staff report. Mr. Johnson did not have anything to add or correct.

Mr. Shad stated that the revised design was 75.43 square feet and said the maximum design allowed based on the linear feet of storefront is 25 square feet. Mr. Shad said the design was three times the size of what is allowed by the Guidelines.

Mr. Roth found the sign to be proportional to the building. Mr. Johnson stated that was his intent, to make the sign proportional, and fit within a defined brick rectangle on the building façade. Mr. Johnson thought reducing the size of the sign further could make it get lost on the building façade. Ms. Tennor said the sign could be

smaller. Mr. Roth said the Guidelines are appropriate for row house storefronts and this is not a one bay wide storefront. He said that this is a situation where the Commission can apply their discretion.

The Commission discussed previous cases involving large signs, such as Main Street Ballroom and Waverly Real Estate. Mr. Reich explained that the Commission approved a larger sign for the Ballroom because the square footage was just for the letters and not the background. Ms. Tennor stated that the Ballroom was also different because it faced the parking lot, whereas this building faces Main Street. Mr. Johnson pointed out that the Ballroom is a destination, so people just need to find the building, whereas he needs to attract customers.

Mr. Reich said that Miller Chevrolet probably had a sign in the same space as the proposed sign. Ms. Tennor asked how large the letters were. Mr. Johnson said they were about 3 feet high. Ms. Tennor asked Mr. Johnson why he didn't want to use a logo. Mr. Johnson said the square logo did not fit the building very well and he found a wider logo would be better. Ms. Zoren said that they did not approve 3-foot tall letters for Main Street Ballroom and it would not be fair to approve that size for this sign. She said the letters are too big. Mr. Reich agreed that the letters look too big and suggested the letters be reduced to 2 feet in height and the background removed. Mr. Johnson said he did not want to apply the letters directly to the building and wanted the contrast with the background colors.

Mr. Taylor pointed out some of the Guideline recommendations that were referenced in the Staff report regarding the size of signs and lettering. Ms. Tennor asked why the Applicant did not want to use letter forms found in the store's logo. Mr. Johnson said the brand was developed in 1998 and they wanted to use something fresher. Mr. Johnson said they could look into reducing the letters to two feet in height and said then the sign would be about 24 total square feet.

Mr. Shad said that he wanted to see options mocked up and recommended the Applicant withdraw and resubmit with options. Ms. Holmes confirmed if the Commission would be okay with the application being processed as a minor alteration. The Commission agreed on that process.

**Motion:** There was no motion. The Applicant withdrew the application and will resubmit to process as a minor alteration.

#### **HPC-18-55 – 3820 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City**

Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations.

Applicant: Craig Stewart

**Background & Scope of Work:** This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District and is also listed on the Howard County Historic Sites Inventory as HO-302. According to MDAT, the historic house was built in 1899. This property is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-302, the Charles Ringley House #1. According to the survey sheet, which dates to 1982, the structure may be log construction that has been covered with siding. However, this information is unconfirmed and can only be determined by opening up walls inside the house.

The Applicant was approved in case HPC-09-25 and HPC-15-39 to construct a new addition on the side of the house. The Applicant now seeks retroactive approval to alter the side deck, which was approved by the HPC on July 2, 2015 in case HPC-15-39. The original application requested approval of a Trex deck with a white vinyl railing. The application was approved, but the railing was only approved to be wood or metal, not Trex. Retroactive approval is now sought for:

- 1) The deck was altered by adding 74 square feet to wrap around and connect to the rear stoop.

- 2) The decking installed was Ipe wood and the railing installed was a bronze Trex railing with bronze aluminum pickets.
- 3) The square posts are off-white, and the material is not referenced in the application but appears to be a PVC product so this item needs to be approved as well.

**Staff Comments:** The application generally complies with Chapter 7 recommendations for new construction of additions and porches. The increased square footage of the deck improves the design and better incorporates the deck into the new addition. The deck design complies with Chapter 7.B, "they should be substantial in appearance, having more of the character of a porch and should be related in detail as much as possible to the style and character of the building." The deck relates to the extended building and the new connectivity (opposed to the original design) gives the appearance of a porch.

The Guidelines recommend, "on any building, use exterior materials and colors similar to or compatible with the texture and color of those on the existing building." The deck is adjacent to the new addition, but the aluminum pickets on the new deck railings are compatible with the railings on the front stairs of the historic building (although they are not typically seen in conjunction with one another). The railing may be a composite, but the material is not noticeable from the street. The bronze colored composite railing blends with the aluminum pickets and matches other accents on the house, such as the gutters and exterior lights. The use of Ipe wood decking over Trex complies with the Guidelines.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends retroactive Approval as submitted.

**Testimony:** Mr. Shad swore in the Applicant, Mr. Craig Stewart. Mr. Shad asked if he had any comments or additions to the staff report. Mr. Stewart said he did not. Mr. Shad asked for information on how the deck design change took place after the application was approved. Mr. Stewart provided some history and said when building the deck he realized he should make a connection to the back of the house.

Mr. Reich said he did not have any comments, as the alterations were on the back of the house and look substantially as originally approved. Ms. Zoren asked about the material for the white posts. Mr. Stewart said the skirt board and posts on the lower portion of the deck are composite wood (Boral) and the upper deck posts are a vinyl sleeve.

Ms. Zoren said her biggest objection is to the vinyl posts and she was fine with the aluminum pickets, which she said seem to be the main material. Ms. Zoren said the wood decking was an improvement over what he was originally approved for.

Mr. Roth asked what skirt board was made out of and Mr. Stewart said it was a Boral product. The Commission and Mr. Stewart discussed resleeving the posts with a different material. Mr. Shad asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak, but no one wanted to testify.

Mr. Reich moved to approve the retroactive application as constructed. There was no second.

Mr. Stewart said that the main objection seems to be the vinyl sleeves and said that they also come in aluminum. Ms. Tennor stated that the original approval was for wood or metal. Mr. Reich said that aluminum is seen in the District and asked if the sleeve is made in bronze aluminum. Mr. Stewart said it was.

**Motion:** Mr. Reich moved to retroactively Approve the deck as built, but change the upper post sleeves to bronze aluminum. Ms. Zoren seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**HPC-18-56 – 8484 - 8494 Main Street, Ellicott City**

Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations.

Applicant: Kevin Breeden

**Background & Scope of Work:** This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the buildings date to 1920. The May 27, 2018 flood washed out the foundations on these row houses. The Applicant sought approval for the foundation replacement/repair in MA-18-42. There was a partial objection to the construction of poured concrete piers without using a brick veneer to match the historic style. The Applicant then amended the application for the construction of brick piers reinforced with rebar. The foundation repairs were approved through the Minor Alterations process. However, in order to repair the foundation, the porch had to be removed for access. The plans to rebuild the porches were not in-kind and did not qualify for the Minor Alterations process. The Applicant now seeks approval for the following work to rebuild the porch while utilizing the existing roof:

- a. The old porch floor will not be reused and the new floor will consist of tongue and groove pressure treated wood decking, to match what was previously there. The decking is not currently painted, and is not proposed to be painted.
- b. The existing railings and pickets will not be reused and the new railings and columns will be pressure treated wood painted the same colors as the existing. The design of the proposed new railings and columns differs from the original and will be a standard squared off railing. The current railing has a rounded top and the proposed railing will be flat. See Figures 12 and 13 below.
- c. The existing turned columns will not be re-used. The proposed replacements are turned wood columns, of a different style, shown in Figure 14 below.

**Staff Comments:** The application does not comply with Chapter 6.F recommendations for porches and balconies. Chapter 6.F recommends, “maintain and repair porches and balconies, including flooring, ceilings, railings, columns, ornamentation and roofing, that are original or that reflect the building’s historic development” and “replace deteriorated features with new materials as similar as possible to the original in materials, design and finish.” The Applicant proposes to remove these features, which are most likely original, and replace them with features that are not of the same design. Materials, such as columns, that are not deteriorated should be retained when possible.

The last unit in the row, 8484, contains a pair of engaged columns and a unique baluster design, as seen in Figure 17. The other units in this set of rowhouses do not have these features.

There is another set of rowhouses in the West End, shown in Figure 18 below, that also have the same balusters shown on 8484 Main Street and the same columns as this set of rowhouses. In the West End this style is only known to be on these two sets of rowhouses. These unique features should be retained to the extent possible, consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standard #5, “distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.”

The continued use of the unpainted pressure treated tongue and groove presents an unfinished look to the porch and would only be an in-kind replacement if the existing porch decking is historic or was replaced with approval (which is currently unknown). The unpainted porch does not comply with Chapter 6.F of the Guidelines, which recommends, “materials generally not appropriate for historic porch replacements include unpainted pressure-treated wood, poured concrete and metal.” Staff recommends the porch floor be painted, or stained, to better comply with the Guidelines.



If the porch is replaced in-kind, there is a possibility (approval is subject to MHT/DHCD) that Façade Improvement funds could be utilized for the reconstruction or repair. This program pays up to 50% of the cost of work to the front façade, with a max of \$10,000.00.

The design of the steps and any possible railings associated with the steps is not clear. An enclosed stair, with tread and riser, would be most appropriate to match the previous look of painted concrete steps.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends:

- 1) Approval of the replacement decking to be tongue and groove to match the existing.
- 2) Approval of the replacement railing if the railing has a profile more in-keeping with the original.
- 3) Reusing the porch posts/columns, newel posts or replacing in-kind to match the existing design.
- 4) Approval of replacement balusters with the condition that they are replaced with a consistent style or design.
- 5) Tax credit pre-approval for Items 1-4.

**Testimony:** Mr. Shad swore in the Applicant, Kevin Breeden, and the contractor, James Eades. Mr. Shad asked if Mr. Breeden if he had any additions or corrections for the staff report. Mr. Breeden explained that the post, railings and pickets on the porch were substantially deteriorated and rotted out at the bottom. He said there was no realistic possibility of reusing them and the goal was to replace them with materials that were substantially similar. He said the replacement posts were not the exact design as the old ones, but were pretty close to it. Mr. Breeden addressed the items in the staff report:

- 1) Tongue and groove flooring – He will put back tongue and groove flooring and stain it.
- 2) Replacement railing – He has been unable to find a top rail that is milled identically to the old one. The railing submitted is not particularly decorative, and they are actively searching and believe they will find something more in-keeping with the original, but it will not be exact.
- 3) The porch posts and columns will be wood painted white.
- 4) Balusters – They will use square balusters like the originals. For the balusters shown in Figure 17, he finds it looks awkward with those two being there since the others are all 2x2 and said they serve no real purpose in terms of aesthetics for the building since the rest of the building has 2x2 posts.

Ms. Tennor asked if the 2x2 posts are the replacements, with the original balusters being those shown in Figure 17. Mr. Reich and Ms. Tennor said that Figure 18 probably represents what the porch balusters originally looked like. Ms. Burgess said that Staff did not see that the columns were rotted. Mr. Breeden said it was like nailing into paper and that the entire bottom was rotted out. Mr. Eades said the columns were not supporting the roof and they were not structurally sound.

Ms. Tennor asked how tall the existing railing is. Mr. Eades said it was not to code and was 28 inches tall. He said the railing could not be made higher the way the posts were designed. He said the new posts will be 42 inches tall. Mr. Reich said that 42 inches will be way out of proportion. Mr. Reich said that once the grading is finished, a railing is not required once you are within 30 inches of grade. Ms. Tennor agreed the proposal would change the entire proportion of the porch.

Ms. Zoren said the posts are a proportional issue. Mr. Reich recommended rebuilding the bottom of the posts. Mr. Breeden said the old posts were thrown away.

Mr. Eades explained that the house sat for two months waiting for permits and BGE, and that to stabilize the foundation the whole porch needed to be taken off. He said that he had to excavate 7 feet out and 8 feet down. Ms. Zoren said they could continue the search on the posts and columns, and find one proportionally closer to the top and bottom piece of the originals. Ms. Tennor said the square base on the proposed post is

almost twice as tall and the turned portion is much higher up than on the original. Mr. Reich said the proposed column has a different profile from the original. Mr. Eades said the posts are 10-feet tall and the porch is 8-feet tall and said they can cut off the bottom 2-feet of the posts. The Commission and the contractor continued to discuss the porch columns.

Ms. Holmes asked what the new newel posts will look like and how they will be reproduced to have the same massing as the old ones. Ms. Tennor concurred that the proposed posts were not as large to replicate the old ones.

Ms. Zoren said that she would like to see, for Staff approval, an elevation of the column in proportion with the height of the proposed railing, and the basic width/height of the porch in a to-scale drawing with dimensions.

**Motion:** Mr. Roth moved to approve:

- 1) The replacement decking to be tongue and groove, with a stain.
- 2) The replacement railing, similar to what is there, subject to Staff approval.
- 3) Replacement porch posts/columns as proposed – 10-foot cut down with a diagram showing proportions of the posts to the rest of the railings, subject to Staff approval.
- 4) Approval of 2x2 replacement balusters

Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Ms. Holmes asked for clarification on the stairs, which will have to be rebuilt. Mr. Breeden said they are using wood stairs that they can stain. Ms. Burgess quoted the staff report, which recommended a closed stair and riser.

**Motion:** Mr. Roth moved to approved replacement stairs to be wood with solid risers, stained to match the deck and closed sides. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**Motion:** Ms. Holmes asked the Commission if the Applicant was pre-approved for tax credits. Mr. Roth moved to approve all items with tax credit pre-approval. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

#### **HPC-18-57 – 3612 Fels Lane, Ellicott City**

Certificate of Approval to construct retaining wall.

Applicant: Seth Michael Martin

**Background & Scope of Work:** This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1900. The Applicant seeks approval to install a stone retaining wall in front of the property where the street and yard meet, in order to stabilize erosion damage that occurs after rain events. The stone retaining wall will be dry stacked and follow the slope of the road and be similar in design to the images shown in the application. The wall will run about 47.4 feet along the road and then turn at the driveway and run about 8.6 feet toward the house. The wall will be about 20 inches thick/wide. The height of the wall will correspond to the slope of the road and will be no less than 2-feet high and no more than 3-feet high.

**Staff Comments:** The proposal generally complies with Chapter 9.D recommendations, “construct new site features using materials compatible with the setting and with nearby historic structures, particularly for features visible from a public way.” The wall will be constructed with stone and designed to look like other stacked stone walls along the street. The application did not contain any detail as to how the wall would start

and end; whether the wall will gradually increase and decrease in height or if there will be an end column at the beginning and end terminus of the wall.

The neighboring property has a stone retaining wall along the front that is a mortared wall with a capstone running the length. There will be a gap between the neighboring wall and existing wall and the walls will not match in style. However, there are other examples on this street of a mortared wall neighboring a dry stacked wall.

The Applicant first submitted a preliminary application for Staff review in August 2018 and Staff provided feedback on the items that needed more information. Some of those items have been addressed, but the end treatments, as mentioned above, still need clarification. A site visit on October 22, 2018 shows that the Applicant has started work on the wall, prior to Commission approval. It does not appear that the proposed height of the wall will block the view of the historic house, but all attempts should be made to keep the wall closer to 2 feet in height.

Of note, any wall over 3 feet high is considered a structure and has to go through DPZ's Zoning Division for approval (with engineering specs and plot plan) and requires a permit through the Department of Inspections, Licenses and Permits.

There is a wood railing located along the side step, shown in Figure 19, that was not approved. The style of the railing is not appropriate, but an application for retroactive approval should be submitted for approval at a future meeting.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends retroactive Approval, but that the Commission consider the following item:

- 1) Additional information regarding the treatment/design of the ends of the wall.

**Testimony:** Mr. Shad swore in the Applicant, Seth Martin. Mr. Shad asked if he had any comments on the staff report. Mr. Martin explained that the wood railing is temporary and he will remove it and said there is no reason to keep it long term.

Ms. Burgess asked if he could explain how he is ending the wall. Mr. Martin explained the stones came from a neighbor's driveway. He passed out a photo of a wall that it will be similar to and said he had to do some rock forming as the rocks are round, so it won't look exactly like the photo but will be a dry stack stone wall, using large rocks at the bottom and doing some shaping for the capstone. Mr. Reich was glad to see real stone used and said the appearance is in keeping with everything else in Ellicott City.

Mr. Reich did not understand staff comments about the ends of the wall. Ms. Burgess explained the need to understand how the wall was ending - with a cap, a column or maybe tapered.

Mr. Martin explained his thoughts for building a 2-foot tall wall and would increase it in height to 2 ½ to 3 feet as needed to create a more level yard. He planned on backfilling the wall with pea gravel and filling the front yard with soil to level it out.

**Motion:** Ms. Tennor moved to approve as submitted. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**HPC-18-58 – 8191 Main Street, Ellicott City**

Certificate of Approval to install two signs/exterior alterations.

Applicant: Jeff Braswell

**Background & Scope of Work:** This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1890. The Applicant proposes to install two signs and make exterior alterations on the building. The first sign is a barber shop pole that will be 28 inches high by 9 inches wide. The pole is a classic design, a red, white and blue cylinder inside a glass tube mounted in stainless steel casing. This will be mounted on the first floor of the building, on the eastern side of the entryway, as shown in Figure 24. The second sign will be a project sign located on the second floor of the building between two windows. The sign will be double sided aluminum with white text and a blue background and read on two lines:

JE  
JAXON EDWIN

The sign will be 24 inches high by 36 inches wide for a total of 6 square feet. The sign will be hung on a bracket. There is not much information in the application regarding the bracket, but it does not appear to be a previously existing bracket. The bracket will be 50 inches wide (4 feet). The sign rendering shows that the bracket would be a black metal and also shows a small gooseneck light protruding from the sign to illuminate it.

**Staff Comments:** The signs generally comply with the Guideline recommendations. The barber shop pole and projecting sign comply with Chapter 11.A recommendations, “keep letters to a minimum and the message brief and to the point. In many cases, symbols or illustrations that communicate that nature of the business can be used.” The projecting sign is limited to two colors, blue and white, which complies with Chapter 11.A, “use a minimum number of colors, generally no more than three.”

Chapter 11.A recommends, “use indirect lighting or concealed light fixtures with concealed wiring to illuminate signs. If the light source will be visible, select a fixture compatible with the style of the building. Minimize glare by focusing the light on the sign.” As depicted in the rendering, the light appears to be focused on the sign and the fixture does not appear to be incompatible with the building. However, the light fixture appears to be large and highly visible. Consistent with the Guidelines, indirect lighting or concealed light fixtures are options that could be explored further.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends retroactive approval of the barber shop pole and approval of the projecting sign and the proposed bracket. Staff recommends an alternate lighting scheme be explored.

**Testimony:** Mr. Shad swore in Jeff Braswell. Mr. Shad asked if he had any comments on the staff report. Mr. Braswell said he doesn’t know much about the lighting fixture, but it matches neighboring signs on the other side of the building and it was the most minimalist bracket he could find.

Ms. Zoren had concerns for the wiring on the face of the building if the conduit was going to be noticeable on the building as in Figure 24 where the barber pole was installed. The Commission discussed where the electric source was located and how it was getting to the bracket. Mr. Braswell said galvanized conduit would need to run on the outside of the building and noted the challenge of going through a brick building. The Commission discussed the conduit and the design of the bracket and the concern of conduit being seen on the façade of the building. The Commission wanted confirmation that the bracket was hollow and that the wire could be run through it and tapped directly into the interior of the building.

Mr. Shad asked why the barber pole was already installed. Mr. Braswell said the owner of building, Trae Reuwer, installed the pole.

Ms. Tennor likes the simple sign and the combination with the barber pole.

Mr. Reich asked how else the lighting could be done and what the Guidelines state regarding sign lighting. Ms. Holmes said the Guidelines state to use indirect lighting or concealed light fixtures with concealed wiring to illuminate signs. If the light source will be visible, select a fixture compatible with the style of the building. Minimize glare by focusing the light on the sign. Mr. Reich asked if a small light could be mounted to the building or if the lighting to the sign was critical. Mr. Braswell stated in the winter, a sign with a light was necessary. Mr. Braswell expressed a willingness to run the conduit internally and punch through the wall where the bracket was mounted.

Ms. Zoren expressed approval for the L bracket as long as there was not wiring or conduit on the facade. The Commission agreed. The Commission suggested using the bracket and running conduit on the interior wall so no conduit would be seen leading to this bracket.

Ms. Zoren asked if a sign border was required for all Main Street signs. Staff clarified that a border was not a Guideline requirement, but the Commission has requested a border for several signs.

**Motion:**

Ms. Zoren moved to retroactively approve the barber shop pole and moved to approve the projecting sign and proposed bracket, under the condition there is no visible conduit or electric work to the bracket. Mr. Reich seconded. Ms. Tennor, Mr. Roth, Mr. Reich, and Ms. Zoren approved. Mr. Shad opposed. The motion passed 4 to 1.

**HPC-18-59 – 3802 Church Road, Ellicott City**

Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations/repairs. Tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Diane Wimsatt

**Background & Scope of Work:** This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1870. The Applicant seeks approval and tax credit pre-approval for the following repairs:

- 1) Replace the wood lattice in-kind on the side of the house as needed, and paint to match the existing color.
- 2) Replace broken panes of window glass as needed (the entire window unit will not be replaced).
- 3) Power wash and paint the trim, including the trim around the windows, on the house.
- 4) Repair wood shutters as needed where wood is rotten; cut out areas of damage and replace with a new piece of wood of the same size and paint to match the existing.

The Applicant also proposes to install a privacy hedge in the backyard, for screening purposes.

**Staff Comments:** Items 1-4 are considered Routine Maintenance per Chapter 5 of the Guidelines, “repair or replacement of roofs, gutters, siding, external doors and windows, trim, lights and other appurtenant fixtures using the same materials and design” and “painting previously painted surfaces using the same color.” This work is also eligible for tax credits per Section 20.112 of the County Code.

The planting of the burning bush, referenced in the application, does not require approval per Chapter 9, which states that Routine Maintenance includes, “planting trees, shrubs or other vegetation.” However, burning bush is an invasive plant and Staff would recommend using a native, non-invasive shrub in its place.

Staff requested additional photos of the area where the hedge is proposed, as well as site plan or aerial showing the location, and is awaiting that information. The planting of the proposed hedge differs from the single burning bush, in that the intent of the hedge row is to be used as a privacy fence and the Commission should ensure that no historic features will be affected by the proposed planting.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval and tax credit pre-approval for Items 1-4.

**Testimony:** Mr. Shad swore in Diane Wimsatt. Mr. Shad asked if Ms. Wimsatt anything to add or clarify to the staff report. Ms. Wimsatt said she will probably use a different shrub from the burning bush that is deer resistant, such as rhododendron or juniper. Ms. Burgess clarified that the HPC does not approve individual shrubbery, but the Guidelines recommend the use of native plants and not an invasive species.

Ms. Burgess asked the Applicant what plant she proposed to use for the hedge. Ms. Wimsatt said they would like an evergreen and listed a few plants they were considering, such as juniper, holly, rhododendron, or viburnum. Ms. Holmes asked if it will be a manicured hedge and Ms. Wimsatt said it will be manicured so that it does not grow over 7 feet tall. Ms. Tennor asked for the dimensions of the hedge and Ms. Wimsatt said it would be about 6 to 8 feet on each side.

Mr. Roth asked if this item needed to be approved by the Commission. Mr. Burgess explained that the hedge will be acting as a fence/barrier, so it needs to be approved. Mr. Lewis clarified that significant landscape changes are within the definition of 'historic structure' including environmental setting and appurtenance, so it would be best if the Commission approved adding a hedge that is acting as a fence since this is considered a significant landscape change. Ms. Wimsatt stated the L shape hedge would be about 8 feet by 8 feet. The Commission agreed that any native evergreen would be appropriate like holly, mountain laurel or juniper.

Ms. Holmes clarified that the Commission did not have any questions on Items 1-4 and they did not.

**Motion:** Ms. Tennor moved to approve the application as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for items 1-4. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

\*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.



Allan Shad, Chair



Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary



Samantha Holmes, Preservation Planner, Acting Recording Secretary